

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more clearly describe the invention.

In the Examiner's Action, claims 1, 2 4-7 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,005,962 to Edelman ("Edelman"). Also in the Action, claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for obviousness in view of Edelman. These rejections are traversed and deemed moot in view of the present amendment.

The present invention discloses a side view mirror with a flat half and a convex half. Both halves of the mirror share a common back and each half of the mirror extends upward from the common back to different heights. See Applicant's Figure 3. The entire convex half of the mirror is higher than that of the flat half of the mirror. Stated another way, the distance from the common back to any surface portion of the mirror defines a thickness for that portion of the mirror. In the present invention, the thickness of all portions of the convex half are greater than the thickness of the flat half of the mirror.

Amended claim 1, for example, recites "An external mirror...comprising a flat half and a convex half...wherein a highest point on the convex half is in a plane that is higher than a plane of the surface of the flat half, and a lowest point on the convex half is in a second plane that is also higher than the plane of the flat half of the mirror."

Similarly, amended claim 6 recites, "A bi-focal mirror with...a convex half and a plane half...the plane half having a flat surface...and the top of the convex half is in a plane that is higher than a plane of the flat surface."

Edelman teaches a dual surface mirror wherein the highest point of the convex half is in the same plane as the surface of the flat half. See Figure 1 and Col. 2, lines 55-57.

Edelman fails to disclose a dual surface mirror wherein the surface portions of the convex half of the mirror exist in planes that are higher than the plane of the flat half of the mirror, as recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 6.

If Edelman is used in a subsequent rejection, the following inconsistencies in the Action

should be addressed. On page 3 of the Action, it is asserted that Figures 2 and 11 of Edelman teach the use of a warning on the mirror that objects are closer than they appear. However, no such warning is shown in Figure 2 and Edelman does not include a Figure 11. Thus, Applicant asserts that Edelman fails to teach this limitation.

On page 4 of the Action, it is asserted that it would have been obvious "to attach the transparent cover to the front of the mirror for the purpose of preventing the reflecting surface of the external mirror." Applicant believes this reason for obviousness has been misstated and requests a clarification of the reason, if Edelman is applied in a later rejection. Further, Applicant contends that it would not have been obvious to use an arched covering with side-view mirrors as none are currently in use or on sale in the marketplace.

For all of the above reasons, claims 1 and 6 are considered allowable over Edelman. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and claims 7-10 depend from claim 6, and each dependent claim is considered allowable for at least the same reasons.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Seto Patents

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Jeffrey K. Seto  
Registration No. 43,419

406 Riverland Dr.  
Salem, VA 24153  
(540) 387-3072

Date: 1-2-05